

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application; reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

1. The disclosure was objected to because the Cross-Reference to Related Applications paragraph was incomplete.

The Cross-Reference to Related Applications paragraph has been amended.

2. Claims 1-5 were rejected under §112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement; the Examiner cited a lack of support for “interpolating” in claim 1, step (c).

Claims 1-5: Application page 7, line 7 recites the equation

$$p^{\text{new}}(n,m) = \alpha I(n,m) q(n,m) + [1 - \alpha I(n,m)] p(n,m)$$

which is the claimed interpolating $q(n,m)$ and $p(n,m)$. Consequently, the application supports claim 1.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4 were rejected as anticipated by Tai; the Examiner cited Tai figs.5,7 and ignored claim 1, step (c) due to the §112 rejection.

Claims 1-2 and 4: Tai does not suggest the interpolating of claim 1, step (c); rather, Tai relates to filtering for digital image resizing.

4. Claims 1 and 5 were rejected as anticipated by Tults; the Examiner cited Tults figs.3,6,7 and ignored claim 1, step (c) due to the §112 rejection.

Claims 1 and 5: Tults does not suggest the interpolating of claim 1, step (c); rather, Tults relates to on-screen display of lower resolution graphics in digital TV and rounds diagonal edges.

5. Claims 1 and 3 were rejected as anticipated by Adams; the Examiner cited Adams figs.2,3 and ignored claim 1, step (c) due to the §112 rejection.

Claims 1 and 3: Adams does not suggest the interpolating of claim 1, step (c); rather, Adams relates to video interlaced-to-progressive conversion with edge detection to determine field interpolation direction.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carlton H. Hoel/

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365